



1968

Faculty Participation in Administrative Decision-Making in Certain Public Junior Colleges in the United States

Gilbert Schechtman
Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

Schechtman, Gilbert, "Faculty Participation in Administrative Decision-Making in Certain Public Junior Colleges in the United States" (1968). *Dissertations*. Paper 958.
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/958

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).
Copyright © 1968 Gilbert Schechtman

FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN ADMINISTRATIVE
DECISION-MAKING IN CERTAIN PUBLIC
JUNIOR COLLEGES IN THE
UNITED STATES

by

Gilbert Schechtman

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

June

1968

LIFE

Gilbert Schechtman was born in Tulsa, Oklahoma, in 1931.

He attended the Tulsa Public Schools and graduated from Will Rogers High School. He received a B.A. from the University of Chicago in 1951 and an M.A. in English from the same institution in 1954.

He has been an English teacher in the Chicago City College system and is at present Dean of Student Personnel Services at Southeast Campus, Chicago City College.

He began doctoral studies at Loyola University in 1962, culminating in the presentation of this dissertation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Grateful acknowledgment is made to the junior college administrators and faculty members who participated in this study by responding to the questionnaire on faculty participation in administrative decision-making in their institutions.

The assistance of Dean S. V. Martorana and Associate Dean K. T. Doran, State University of New York, was very helpful to the writer in his study of the legislation in that state relating to the role of junior college faculty in policy making.

Miss Martha Parrent, Staff Assistant, American Association of Junior Colleges, kindly supplied data and publications.

Mr. Robert Lahti, William Rainey Harper Junior College, and Professor Raymond Schultz, The Florida State University, have generously provided information and material from the Subcommittee of the American Association of Junior Colleges Commission on Administration.

Many thanks are due to Mr. John Roueche, Junior College Specialist at the University of California at Los Angeles, who provided very valuable unpublished position papers and studies from the Clearinghouse collection at his institution.

Dr. Melvin Heller, Dr. James Smith, and Dr. John Wozniak have provided support and inspiration to the writer as members of his advisory committee and as teachers in his graduate work.

Finally, gratitude must be expressed to Mrs. Charlotte Mathes for her valuable clerical services.

Gilbert Schechtman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIFE	11
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	111
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
I. THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF THIS STUDY	1
II. BACKGROUND	6
III. METHOD OF THIS STUDY	46
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	52
V. SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	72
APPENDIX	81

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Percentage of Administrators Reporting Faculty Involvement in Policy Making in Junior Colleges According to Size of College	42
2. Percentage of Administrators Reporting Faculty Involvement in Policy Making in Junior Colleges According to Size of College in the Specific Area of Salary Schedule Revision. .	43
3. Percentage of Administrators Reporting Faculty Involvement in Policy Making According to Type of Institutional Control	43
4. Percentage of Responses to Questionnaire in each Category Arranged by State	53
5. Percentage of Responses by State in Each Category	54
6. Percentage of Responses in High and Low Participation Categories by State	56
7. Relationship of Size of City to Faculty Participation . . .	61
8. Relationship of Size of Enrollment to Faculty Participation	62
9. Relationship of Ratio of Full-Time and Part-Time Teachers to Faculty Participation	63
10. Relationship of Source of Teacher Recruitment to Faculty Participation	64
11. Relationship of Kind of Legal Control to Faculty Participation	65
12. Relationship of Kind of Physical Facility to Faculty Participation	66
13. Relationship of Faculty Council to Faculty Participation . .	67
14. Relationship of Collective Bargaining Agent to Faculty Participation	68

Table		Page
15.	Relationship of Affiliation of Collective Bargaining Agent to Faculty Participation	69
16.	Relationship of a Collective Bargaining Contract to Faculty Participation	70
17.	Relationship of Board Rules to Faculty Participation	71

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF THIS STUDY

This study is concerned with the extent and nature of faculty involvement in administrative decision-making in American public junior colleges. More particularly it will focus upon practices in nine states: California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, Mississippi, New York, Texas, and Washington. An explanation of this selection of states will be made later in the study.

The primary investigative method to be employed is a questionnaire submitted to every public junior college in the nine states mentioned.

The data derived from the questionnaire will be analyzed in Chapter IV to establish or reject the following major hypothesis:

1. Public junior colleges are characterized by a high degree of faculty participation in general administrative decision-making.

In addition, the following related hypothesis will be independently examined:

2. Faculty participates in decision-making regarding salary.
3. Faculty participates in decision-making regarding class size and teacher load.
4. Faculty participates in decision-making regarding probation, admission, withdrawal, student discipline, and other student personnel practices.
5. Faculty participates in decision-making regarding the introduction

of new curricula and the modification of existing curricula.

6. Faculty participates in decision-making regarding the constructing of new buildings, the remodeling of existing facilities, space allocation, and room use.

7. Faculty participates in decision-making regarding the appointment of new teachers and the granting of tenure.

8. Faculty participates in decision-making regarding the appointment of department chairmen and administrators.

Finally, an effort will be made to determine the relationship of certain geographical, populational and other characteristics of the colleges in the study to the extent of faculty participation in these colleges. Specifically, the following hypotheses will be tested:

9. The extent of faculty participation is related to the state in which the college is located.

10. The extent of faculty participation is related to the size of the town in which the college is located.

11. The extent of faculty participation is related to the size of enrollment.

12. The extent of faculty participation is related to the ratio of full-time to part-time teachers.

13. The extent of faculty participation is related to the source of recruitment of teachers.

14. The extent of faculty participation is related to the kind of legal control exercised over the college.

15. The extent of faculty participation is related to the kind of

physical facilities occupied by the college.

16. The extent of faculty participation is related to the presence or absence of a faculty council or senate.

17. The extent of faculty participation is related to the presence or absence of a collective bargaining agent, recognized by the board.

18. The extent of faculty participation is related to the affiliation of the bargaining agent.

19. The extent of faculty participation is related to the presence or absence of a collective bargaining agreement or contract.

20. The extent of faculty participation is related to the presence or absence of board rules providing for such participation.

As background to an understanding of the subject an examination of the data of the questionnaire will be preceded by several other considerations. The traditional role played by faculty in administrative decision-making in public schools and in universities will be examined. The nature of the junior college as an institution will be studied, as it bears on the problem of faculty involvement in administrative decision-making. Legislative provisions which are pertinent will be outlined and discussed. Finally, the current literature on the subject will be reviewed, including previous research studies.

No necessity has been felt to define terms in this introduction. Those who are teachers and administrators need little in the way of formal definition. By faculty is meant those whose primary task is instruction. By administrators, those who are concerned with directing the instructional program and creating a climate for instruction. Administrative decision-making

implies the process of making decisions directly affecting the actions of other staff members, generally involving sanctions in the event of nonperformance.¹

A word should be said about the necessity for such a study as this and its importance to the problems of practical administration. Increasingly the newspapers carry front page stories of the delay in the opening of schools all over the country because of threatened or actual strikes and work stoppages by teachers. A discussion of the prevailing situation in American junior colleges can be found later in this study in a review of current literature on the subject. In the words of one commentator with first hand knowledge of the strained relationships which can prevail in faculty-administration confrontations, present faculty-administration relationships are in extremis.² It is clear to most observers that the present climate is one of "teacher militancy." Those with knowledge of the sources of teacher dissatisfaction know that much of this dissatisfaction can be traced to a desire by teachers

¹For a discussion of the concept of administration as essentially decision-making see William R. Dill, "Decision-Making," Behavioral Science and Administration, ed. Daniel E. Griffiths, Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964). Also see William J. Gore, Administrative Decision-Making: A Heuristic Model (New York: Wiley, 1964).

²Ray A. Howe, "Faculty Administration Relationships In Extremis," Junior College Journal, XXXVII (November, 1966), 14-15.

to influence decisions which affect their welfare and the conditions of their employment. Though it is not the purpose here to establish principles which should prevail in faculty-administration relationships, it is hoped that the data of this study will furnish information useful in the solution of a major problem in junior college administration.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND

Traditional Policy Role of Faculty in Schools and Universities

Guidelines to practice in any new organization, and the modern junior college is a relative baby in the family of educational institutions in this country, are most frequently framed in accordance with and consistent with practices in analogous organizational structures. This premise is true because no business or educational or social organization is antiseptically conceived or born. New institutions rise to meet new needs or to meet old needs better, but they come into being with a history of compromise and deliberation, wrenching, shaping, and accommodation which leave upon them the traceable vestiges of the structures they have replaced.

In particular it should be noted that the junior college has never had a reserve of teachers to draw upon for staffing who identified themselves as junior college teachers or administrators. Even now, after more than fifty years of active history, there is no significant program for the training of junior college teachers, and only recently a program for the training of junior college administrators. Thus, it takes very little thought to deduce that the teachers in American junior colleges are identifiable as having been part of three vocational groups:

1. Those who have taught in secondary schools and who, in general, see

junior college teaching as promotion in prestige, salary, and conditions of employment.

2. Those who either aspire to university or college teaching or who have taught at that level and who, in general, see junior college teaching as a demotion in prestige and working conditions, though possibly not in salary.

3. Those who are in business or industry and who are recruited into junior college teaching, frequently on a part-time basis at first, because they possess a particular competency or technical knowledge which is in demand.

In view of these considerations it becomes clear that the prevailing practice of participation of faculty in administrative decision-making in public junior colleges will be dependent to some degree on the guidelines prevailing in other kinds of educational institutions, and the expectations of junior college teachers with regard to the exercise of control over conditions of their employment will be similarly conditioned by the institutions with which they have been identified or with which they identify themselves.

In business or industry where tenure is unknown, academic freedom not an issue, expectations of autonomy and participation in administrative decision-making are not so frequently present. Dill points out, in fact, that the traditional autonomy of the teacher is in lieu of the salary and fringe benefits that a similarly skilled worker might receive in industry. Burton Clarke see a sociological similarity between the situation of the expert professor, with his strong discipline orientation and his interest in pure

¹Dill, 221.

research and the scientist in industry who, whatever the perquisites in salary and fringe benefits, in many cases refuses to identify himself with the goals of the industrial organization which he serves but endeavors instead to pursue independently the course of his scientific interest.¹ However, one may speculate that the influence and practices of management-employee relationships in industry have little to do with the expectations of junior college teachers regarding their participation in the decision-making process, for recruitment from industry is not a large source of teachers in junior colleges.

Of much greater importance are the influences of current practices in colleges and in universities and in the public schools. Influences from both the "upper" and "lower" institutions are important. Very many junior college teachers are "broken in" in secondary school teaching. On the other hand, let the author assert pragmatically that junior college teachers tend to identify totally with higher education.² The reasons for this identification or its consequences can be clearly seen. Some unit district junior colleges have a

¹Burton R. Clarke, "Faculty Organization and Authority," The Study of Academic Administration, ed. Terry Lunsford (Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1953), p. 17.

²This observation is supported by many writers. See, for instance, the following: John Lombardi, "Faculty in the Administrative Process," Junior College Journal, XXXVIII (November, 1966), 10. Sigurd Rislov, "Faculty Participation in Community College Government," (unpublished manuscript, Wayne State University, College of Education, 1965), p. 3. Also the remarks of a California president in Report of the Subcommittee on the Role of Faculty in Institutional Policy-Making, American Association of Junior Colleges Commission on Administration (American Association of Junior Colleges, February 28, 1967), p. 12. (Mimeographed.)

higher pay differential for junior college teachers with preparation and experience comparable to high school teachers who teach for less.¹ There is an increasing effort to separate junior colleges from common school administration.² Junior college teachers seek membership in professional organizations which serve the colleges and universities. In terms of aspirations, then, it is not surprising that junior college teachers might expect the kind of administration-faculty relationship which prevails in colleges and universities. And, similarly, it is not surprising that in terms of actual practice junior college teachers may settle for administration-faculty relationships characteristic of the secondary school, since they have been nurtured--many of them--in that atmosphere, and so have their administrators, for the most part.

What is, then, the role of faculty in administrative policy-making in American colleges and universities? The answer to this question, complicated as it is by the diversity of institutions referred to, cannot easily be stated in broad, loose, quantitative terms. It is necessary, for instance, to specify which domains of control are referred to, since some studies would seem to show faculty influence varying greatly--little interest being shown, for instance, in such important aspects of administration as admissions and student personnel services. Whatever the answer, the relationship of the faculties of American colleges and universities to their administrators and their trustees is

¹This has been the case in Chicago City College while it was operated by the Chicago Board of Education.

²The recent Illinois Master Plan for Higher Education encourages separation of junior colleges from common school districts, for instance.

certainly nothing like the traditional "community of scholars" administering their own enterprise and managing their own endowment, the picture we get from a study of the history of the European university, or that which emerges from Mr. C. P. Snow's fictionalized account of the British university.¹

Both Burton Clarke and G. Lester Anderson in their remarks in the published proceedings of the 1963 Berkely Conference on the Study of Academic Administration reflect a somewhat pessimistic note in assessing the role of faculty in the administrative function.

Clarke concludes:

But in the combination of forms of organization and forms of authority that we find today within the campus and within the faculty itself, there are certain trends that are stronger than others and certain features that tend toward dominance. The society at large is tending to become a society of experts, and the campus has already arrived at this state. Expertise is a dominant characteristic of the campus, and organization and authority cluster around it. Because of its expertness, together with its evergrowing size, the faculty moves away from community, moves away from collegiality of the whole. The faculty moves toward decentralized or federated structure, and authority moves toward clusters of experts and the individual expert. Thus professional authority tends to become the dominant form of authority, and collegial and bureaucratic features fall into a subsidiary place.²

Anderson considers Max Weber's concept of collegiality, a concept of collective decision-making opposed to strict bureaucratized control of the decision-making process, which would seem to provide a model for a workable kind of college organization. But Anderson concludes: "Our assumption

¹The Affair (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1960).

²Clarke, 51.

continues to be, then, that the prevailing basic organizational pattern of institutions of higher education is bureaucratic. . . . We have said that the force which may bring about a change is that of the faculty."¹

Anderson's point is that, though on principle he opposes the bureaucratization of education in a manner analogous to that in business and government, there is nothing on the horizon which gives promise of a different kind of university government. Both Clarke and Anderson share in the projections of those who are concerned about the multiversity: that increasingly the professor becomes more and more concerned about less and less--that his allegiance is not to the institution, not to the student, not even to himself, but to the academic discipline, his exploration of it and his research within it. About such mundane matters as institutional planning, institutional philosophy, or student personnel policies, he cannot be concerned.

A U.S. Office of Education study of the smaller, privately controlled liberal arts college gives us a picture that differs little from that in the larger university.² Academic personnel policies are framed and administered largely by the administration. Initial appointment and recruitment of faculty

¹G. Lester Anderson, "The Organizational Character of American Colleges and Universities," The Study of Academic Administration, ed. Terry Lunsford (Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1953) p. 17.

²John H. Russel and Archie R. Ayers, Case Studies in the Liberal Arts College, Academic Administration, U. S. Department HEW Bulletin 1964, Number 12, OE 53020 (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1964), pp. 5-34.

appears to be the job of the academic dean or sometimes the department chairman, functioning as an administrator. Even tenure decisions appear to be made in most cases without formal faculty consultation, though in matters of promotion and salary increment the faculty committee is active.

In curriculum the faculty plays more of a role, usually through a faculty committee on curriculum. In many cases this committee is administratively appointed and includes a large number of administrators. The faculty representation on the committee is often through department chairmen. In the area of instruction, by which the investigators mean the procedural arrangements for scheduling classes, assigning rooms, arranging for texts, etc., the administration plays the largest part. Also in the area of student services and budget allocation and control the administration plays the largest role as decision-maker, if it does not exercise sole autonomy in such decisions.

What can be concluded from these considerations? At first glance there seems to be a paradox. The college instructor or professor, so often felt to be independent and autonomous, appears to play a relatively minor role in framing many of the policies which affect his conditions of employment and the education of his students.

But the paradox can be resolved. The college professor seeks autonomy in the pursuit of his discipline and in research. He tends to view his teaching responsibilities as a necessary, though frequently not very welcome concomitant of his important professional interests. And as for "housekeeping," budget allocation, time scheduling, probation and admission policy--he sees these as an intrusion upon his professional responsibilities and a drain upon his available time. ✓

Yet the literature which shall be examined later in this introduction will reveal that it is precisely in such areas as the latter that the junior college faculty member seeks greater recognition as a policy maker.

Recognizing the danger of generalizations about teachers as collective groups, one may hazard an interesting, if unsubstantiated (and unsubstantiable, perhaps) theory. It has already been noted that the main sources for recruitment of junior college teachers are the secondary schools on the one hand and the pool of those who have come from the graduate schools aspiring to teach at the college and university level, but who have been temporarily or permanently thwarted. It can be shown further that in many cases the "upwardly mobile" high school teacher seeking junior college employment tends to be aggressive, articulate, and intelligent. On the other hand the would-be college or university teacher frequently displays a professional aggressiveness which would normally evidence itself in the arena of academic freedom and professional disputation and competitive research. But deprived of the proper academic climate--endowment, resources, time, publishability conferred by identification with a "prestige" university--the aspiring academician like the aspiring secondary school teacher must look for an outlet for his competitive energies. Thus, the desire for control, autonomy, and manipulation is turned upon the day to day management of the college, and faculty participation in what might be considered mundane housekeeping by the university professor becomes all absorbing for the junior college teacher.

It remains to examine briefly the situation in the elementary and secondary schools with regard to teacher participation in administrative decision-making. There seems to be very little research into this important

aspect of administration in the recent literature, though much is written about it. Most of what is written comes from administrators, and much of this takes the form of guidelines which may reflect actual practice, but more likely do not; otherwise such public protestations on the part of administrators would be less in evidence.

Archie R. Dykes gives what may be a fair summary of the function of teachers in administrative decision-making in the common schools:

Traditionally, teachers have had little voice in important educational decisions. Their role largely has been one of accepting that which emanated down from the hierarchy of authority. In many school districts today, the democratic principles so widely proclaimed by those in positions of authority and the involvement of teachers in important decisions are separate realities. Decisions are made and handed down to the teachers on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. In these school districts, the basic decision-making processes remain completely outside the province of the teachers and their influence is of little consequence when the hard realities of important decisions are faced.

More than a few administrators and school boards deeply and actively involve teachers in the most basic educational decisions. Teachers in some school districts have a major voice in policy development, and other important concerns. Theirs is a responsible share in the decision-making process. However, for the great mass of teachers, participation in important educational decisions, either directly or by representation, is an activity never experienced.¹

There is evidence that some school systems have begun to move in the direction of greater teacher participation. Minneapolis schools have for some years encouraged the formation of faculty councils to assume some of the administrative tasks traditionally reserved for principals, such as planning faculty meetings. In addition these councils express teacher opinion on

¹Archie R. Dykes, "Democracy, Teachers, and Educational Decision-Making," School and Society, XCII (April 4, 1964), 155.

"bread and butter matters," insurance, pensions, etc.¹ According to Provus and deLauter, the "Time to Teach" project organized by the NEA Department of Classroom Teachers in 1964 has had as one of its byproducts the assumption by teachers of greater administrative control. The program, however, is in a pilot form at present. In promoting the organization of teachers to increase efficiency and decrease their assignments to non-educational duties, the "Time to Teach" program is at the same time promoting and encouraging greater teacher control in other aspects of their work.²

But, not surprisingly, much of the literature written by administrators is an effort to delimit the extent of faculty involvement in administrative decision-making or to question the fundamental premise that faculty should so participate. A very informative study by G. H. Moeller seems to indicate that teachers favor a very highly structured school system where their autonomy may be limited but is nonetheless clearly defined, in contrast to a loosely structured system where their individual power could be exercised to a greater extent but where nobody knows "who is boss."³ Francis G. Cornell advances the idea that teacher participation is not an unquestioned principle of administrative practice, but rather that the extent of teacher participation is a question to be decided separately in each case. According to Cornell the extent of faculty participation in administrative decision-making should be

¹Russell D. Brackett, "Faculty Council," Nation's Schools, LVIII (December, 1956), 61-62.

²M.M. Provus and A. deLauter, "Self Direction for Teachers; The Time to Teach Project," NEA Journal, LV (January, 1966), 49-51.

³G.H. Moeller, "Bureaucracy and Teachers' Sense of Power," School Review, LXXII (Summer, 1964), 137-157.

conditioned by the nature of the decision to be made, the nature of the faculty, the gravity of the consequences affected by the decision, and other considerations. An interesting distinction is made by Cornell between "informal organizations" where democracy is an important principle of decision-making and the formal organization of the school where authority is legally delegated and placed. Moreover, he cautions that the administrator has the power to direct compliance with decisions, though the faculty does not. Cornell concludes, "Although many of us would agree that teacher participation in administrative decision-making is a fine thing, there are no defensible grounds for us to conclude that, since it is good, more of it would be better."¹

Milton Ploghoft considers teacher participation in one aspect of administration--staffing, and then generalizes to caution moderation in teacher participation in this as well as in other aspects of administrative activity, with the possible exceptions of curriculum and instruction. His grounds of opposition include the position that teachers are busy enough doing what they have to do--teach--and that it is "dangerous" to delegate authority where there is not at the same time legal responsibility for making and implementing administrative decisions.²

In general, a review of the literature and recourse to the practical experience must lead to the conclusion that the climate of public school administration certainly does not encourage the teaching staff to participate

¹Francis G. Cornell, "When Should Teachers Share in Making Administrative Decisions?" Nation's Schools, LIII (May, 1954), 43-45.

²Milton E. Ploghoft, "Teacher Participation in Selecting New Personnel," Clearing House, XXII (January, 1958), 301-303.

in making administrative decisions in sensitive and critical areas. Decisions about tenure and contract policies, salary considerations, space allocations, budget priorities, even the adoption of new curricula are most frequently unilateral administrative decisions. The current progress (or its lack) in recognition by boards of education of bargaining agents for teacher groups is an indication that the kind of decision-making that teacher groups wish to share in has been traditionally looked upon as administrative prerogative.

This is not to say that there is not ample expression by school administrators that administration is a democratic process, a "two-way street," a joint endeavor. Nor is the implication here intended that such assertions by school administrators are platitudinous or falsely pious. School administrators have long adhered to the principle of "democratic administration," a principle which holds that institutions which are formed to support a political democracy must in themselves be democratically administered.¹

Whatever its virtues or validity, the principle is ingrained in the whole theory of American school administration. If it is slighted in practice, it is perhaps another of those honest schisms between the ideal and the real which we see in politics, race relations, and other spheres of American life.

Decision-Making in the Junior College

Without undertaking a complete study of the junior college as an institution, it will be valuable to note certain characteristics peculiar to the

¹An early statement of this principle and its rationale can be found in Ward Ira Miller, Democracy in Educational Administration (New York: Teachers College Columbia University, 1942), p. 40.

junior college and relevant to this study.¹ In general these are characteristics arising from what is variously called the multi-purpose or comprehensive aspect of the junior college program.

The junior college is by design a responsive institution, responsive to the needs of its students and to those of the community. In a period of rapid social change it is not surprising that the junior college is rapidly changing in its physical characteristics and in its program. For instance, enrollment predictions are possible with fair accuracy in a public high school from year to year, nor is enrollment planning difficult in an institution of higher education practicing selective admission. But in a junior college with the traditional "open door" policy in admissions, prediction is virtually impossible, particularly in urban junior colleges.²

Again, this institutional flexibility of the junior college is evident in curriculum. Junior colleges are strongly committed to preparing their students for immediate entry into the world outside the college, and this means a strong interest in vocational preparation. In a world of work in which crisis and flux is the norm, there is little hope for an orderly, stable vocational-technical program. The Board of Overseers at a college or

¹Two very good institutional studies are Barton R. Clarke, The Open Door College: (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), and Ieland L. Medsker, The Junior College: Progress and Prospect (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960).

²One way of dealing with the problem of flexible enrollment and fluctuation in size is the practice of employing large numbers of part-time or temporary teachers on half yearly contracts, with employment frequently tentative, depending on enrollment. Part-time teachers constitute from 20%-50% of many junior college staffs. Ratios of part-time to full-time teachers are given in 1967 Junior College Directory (Washington: AAJC, 1967)

university need not feel obligated to devise a program in immediate response to any gap in the economy or to satisfy the collective desires of its clientele; the board and administration of a junior college acknowledge precisely this obligation.

One can observe this characteristic of change in examining the gross physical characteristics of the junior college, without reference to its program. The attrition rate, for instance, is high. Medsker suggests that the median per cent of junior college students who ultimately receive a two year degree is about one-third of those who enter.¹ However, if instead of selecting a median figure from a ranking of individual colleges, one were to take the total enrollment of all American junior colleges and compare it to the total number of graduates, the figure would be much less.² In large urban colleges the drop-out and flunkout each semester can easily take one-fourth to one-third of the total enrollment. Transiency of the student population is an accepted fact of life in junior colleges.

The diversity of characteristics of the student population is another factor which complicates the curriculum problem. Medsker points out that roughly 6% of entering junior college students in his study scored one standard deviation above the mean for entering four year college students on

¹Medsker, 95.

²The large, big city colleges have few graduates. Current figures may be seen in American Junior Colleges, ed. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., and Paul L. Houts (Washington: American Council on Education, 1967).

the ACE. On the other hand, the difference in means between the entering junior college student and the four year college student is significantly in favor of the latter.¹ Thus, there is an unusually wide ability span among junior college students--quite understandably, since everyone is eligible to enter. This last factor results in a great variation in age and maturity level of students.

What does this picture of change, diversity, variability suggest? It seems clear that in an institution which is perpetually building, growing, and developing an extraordinary number of decisions must be made. There is, in effect, no status quo. Each registration brings with it a total new decision as to course offerings, allocations between departments, course cancellations, dropping of curricula, room allocation, which are not present in an institution which can control some of the variables. Staffing is another important decision which is ever present. The present investigator has added nine new full-time teachers to a former staff of eleven within one year. The current American Junior Colleges lists 751 junior colleges, almost 100 more than the edition published four years previously.² The very newness of so many American junior colleges is responsible for the great number of decisions to be made, many of which directly relate to the conditions of employment for the junior college teacher.

¹Madsen, 37-38.

²American Junior Colleges, xi.

Legislation Affecting Faculty Participation
in Administrative Decision-Making

By legislation affecting faculty participation in administrative decision-making is meant mandates coming from three potential sources: the state legislature, some statewide agency created by the legislature, or the local board of control of the college, if it is locally controlled. The legislation coming from the latter two sources would be called "administrative legislation," but could be as influential a factor in school administration as control exercised in the legislature itself.

The questionnaire, reported upon in Chapter III of this study, will consider what kinds of local board encouragement of faculty participation in administrative decision-making exist, since item 12 of the questionnaire invites the respondent to enumerate board rules or policies regarding faculty participation.

In this section consideration will be given to legislative enactments from the first two sources.

Of the nine states considered in this study, two have legislation at the state level encouraging faculty participation in administrative decision-making: California and New York.

Title 5, Section 131.6, of The California Administrative Code was enacted in 1964. Technically, of course, it is administrative legislation, since it was an enactment of the State Board of Education. In reality, however, it was a response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution Number 48, passed May 27, 1963, by the State Assembly and Senate, requesting that the Board of Education act.

Thus, this act is legislative in origin.¹

Section 131.6 states in part:

"Academic senate" or "faculty council" means an organization formed in accordance with this section whose primary function is, as the representative of the faculty, to make recommendations to the administration and the governing board of a school district with respect to academic and professional matters.

In order that the faculty may have a formal and effective procedure for participating in the formation of district policies on academic and professional matters described in (a) (2), the faculty first must decide by secret ballot to have an "academic senate" or "faculty council," in which case the governing board of each school district shall establish such an "academic senate" or "faculty council" in each junior college district

A Consultant to the Bureau of Junior College General Education in the State of California Department of Education has advised that there is presently pending before the State Board of Education the proposed change of two subsections of Section 131.6. The effect of the proposed changes is quite evidently to strengthen the channel of communication between the faculty and the governing board of the college. Subsection (d) in its amended form states the following:

Upon the request of the academic senate or faculty council . . . the governing board, or such board members or administrative officers as it may designate, shall meet and confer with representatives of the academic senate or faculty council with respect to recommendations made or proposed to be made by the senate or council.²

¹Carl Winter, "Academic Senates in the Junior Colleges," California Education, II (November, 1964), 15.

²Letter to the author from Carl G. Winter, Consultant Bureau of Junior College General Education, State of California, Department of Education, June 27, 1967.

The relationship between board and faculty implied by the above is at least not inconsistent with the theory of administration which holds that the educational administrator is a kind of servant whose job is to carry out efficiently a policy which he does not shape and to coordinate the total efforts of the faculty and board. A "conservative" might find the relationship in which the administrator might be "bypassed" as a channel of communication between faculty and board an indefensible one.

A further complication in the California situation is the adoption by the legislature of Article 5, Sections 13080-13087, of the Education Code, which makes mandatory the formation of negotiating councils in each school district composed of representatives of all teacher organizations for the purposes of consultation.

The scope of representation shall include all matters relating to employment conditions and employer-employee relations, including, but not limited to wages, hours and other terms and conditions of employment.¹

In addition, the act empowers discussion by the negotiating council about

all matters relating to the definition of educational objectives, the determination of the content of courses and curricula, the selection of textbooks, and other aspects of the instructional program to the extent such matters are within the discretion of the public school employer or governing board under the law.²

Since California junior colleges may comprise a district or be contained

¹California Education Code, 13084, p. 585.

²California Education Code, 13085, p. 586.

within a district as part of a commonly administered K-14 grade system, the California junior colleges are affected by the act and a confusion has arisen as to whether the faculty councils enjoined by the State Board of Higher Education or the negotiating councils mandated by the legislature or both should represent the colleges in college-board negotiations.¹

The California junior colleges have been frequently cited as a strong locus, perhaps the strongest, of current unrest in faculty-administration relations.² One observer comments that such pressure from faculty may be a result of "liberal" policies in faculty-administrator relationships, rather than a cause of such policies.³ Whatever the cause and effect relationship which prevails, the most liberal legislation favoring faculty participation in administrative decision-making is found in California, and correspondingly the greatest agitation, perhaps, for such participation.

It is interesting to note the paradox of a state which has expressed its political conservatism in electing an admittedly conservative governor, a state which had had an influential Superintendent of Public Instruction in Rafferty

¹John Lombardi, "Faculty in the Administrative Process," Junior College Journal, XXXVII (November, 1966), 11-12. Carl G. Winter in his letter of June 27, 1967, to the author indicates that there is a bill pending in the legislature which would have the administrative code rather than the Education Code apply to junior colleges.

²See Lombardi; also Report of the Subcommittee on the Role of Faculty in Institutional Policy-Making, p. 5; also Bill J. Priest, "Faculty Administrator Relationships," Junior College Journal, XXXIV (March, 1964), 8.

³Howe, Junior College Journal, XXXVII, 15.

who is "old school" in many respects, which, nevertheless, is far in the vanguard in respect to liberal teacher protection laws and legislation making for faculty participation in important administrative decisions.

Another state which has seen fit to provide legislative encouragement of faculty participation in decision-making is New York. In that state the operation of eighteen of the thirty-four public two year colleges in the state is part of the program of the State University of New York; consequently, the regents of that institution control policy in community colleges. Section seven of Regulations for Community Colleges Operating Within the Program of State University of New York, adopted by the State University Trustees on June 14, 1966, is headed "Institutional Procedures and Regulations." As an introduction the Trustees specify:

The faculty shall participate significantly in the formulation of policy relating to student health, scholarship, standards of admission, attendance and discharge of students, curriculum and other study programs, the granting of degrees, student activities, extra-curricular activities and student discipline. The faculty through its regular organization in the college shall also present recommendations to the president regarding (a) preparation of the instructional budget and (b) appointments, reappointments, tenure, special salary increments, promotions and leaves of absence of members of the instructional staff.¹

On April 13, 1967, the Board of Trustees of State University of New York passed a resolution to create a faculty council for the community colleges under its control.² The structure of this council is carefully worked out. In

¹Regulations for Community Colleges Operating Within the Program of State University of New York. Adopted by the State University Trustees June 14, 1966, Section 7, p. 16.

²Articles of Organization, Faculty Council of the Community Colleges which operate within the program of the State University of New York, April 13, 1967.

addition to some administrative representation there is to be a faculty representative from each of the included community colleges.

The council is conceived of as a channel of communication for local governing boards of the community colleges, administration and faculty of the State University of New York, the Chancellor of the University, and as a forum for communication between the various community colleges.

These then are the legal foundations of faculty participation in administrative decision-making in the two states within this study which provide such legislation. The "law" is administrative in both states, though the California administrative law arises from legislative mandate.

Legislative action relating to faculty participation in administrative decision-making in public junior colleges is extremely important, because the principle that the state shall control education, directly and through its extension--the local board, is so thoroughly established in educational practice. The superintendent, dean, or president who denies faculty participation on the grounds that delegation of powers of administrative control to the faculty is contrary to statutory provision cannot be easily put aside.

Even the California regulation relating to the establishment of faculty councils or senates, the most liberal legislation promoting faculty participation, has been judged in its only legal "test" to give the faculty merely "advisory" powers within the state constitutional framework.¹

¹Winter, California Education, II, 16. Lombardi, Junior College Journal, XXXVII, 10.

Perhaps much of the leadership in defining the role of faculty in decision-making will come from the legislatures. Much of this state legislation will be concerned with the rights and limitations of boards of education in bargaining collectively with teachers. It is to be hoped that the legislatures can also turn their attention to the question of how far and to what extent the junior college faculty shall influence and control broad institutional policy and philosophy--not merely the physical conditions of employment.

Current Literature and Previous Studies

The literature dealing with faculty participation in administrative decision-making in junior colleges is sparse and fairly recent in publication. Much or most of it has appeared in the Junior College Journal and is written by administrators. Other than a few statistical studies, which shall be reviewed in the latter part of this section, the literature consists primarily of position papers on the following issues:

1. What is the place of faculty in junior college administrative decision making?
2. What institutionalized forms or channels can such participation take?
3. What particular areas should the faculty function in as advisors or decision-makers?
4. What is the present state of faculty-administration relationships and what kind of future can be foreseen for such relationships?

What is the place of faculty in junior college administrative decision-making? A keynote in the "debate" on the proper role of faculty in

administrative decision-making was struck by John Bartky in 1957 and developed in subsequent exchanges of letters.¹ Bartky develops a point of view which is based upon a conception of two kinds of institutions within a democracy. The first he calls an "immature" institution, which is one whose goals, methods, and functions are ill defined, vague, and nebulous--an institution which is tentative and exploratory in its approach.

Such an institution is exemplified by the university, an institution whose purpose is to seek the truth through instruction, speculation and research. Since the purpose of the university is, in a sense, to seek out new values, to examine traditional ones, and to solve problems as they arise, the university must, so Bartky reasons, be itself a democratic institution. Since its path is not clearly demarcated and its end not clearly defined, it must have a broad democratic base of control which encourages movement, change, and free exploration.

The junior college, on the other hand, is a representative of what Bartky calls a "mature" institution. Its function, clearly mandated by society,

¹John Bartky, "The Nature of Junior College Administration," Junior College Journal, XXVIII (September, 1957), 3-7. A response from two junior college instructors is Morris F. Taylor and Herbert W. Dick, "More About the Nature of Junior College Administration," Junior College Journal, XXVIII (December, 1957), 20-22. The Bartky-Taylor-Dick controversy is summarized and analyzed in Clyde E. Blocker, Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, Jr., The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1965) 188-200.

is the following, according to Bartky:

1. To meet the needs of the community.
2. To educate the individual to the maximum of his capacity.¹

Bartky explains:

. . . A junior college should approach its objectives in the manner of a well trained battleship. Society has set its objectives and expects them to be attained. There is no place for debate that frustrates society's purposes. It is undemocratic to act in ways that hamper society's designated leadership. The junior college organization has a job to perform and must not dissipate its efforts with too much consideration of the whims of a faculty and with tolerance toward those who would dilly dally with its socially defined purposes. In this way only it can become a truly democratic organization.²

This is strong stuff, and though it may express what many a contemporary president or dean may feel, it is hardly likely that the contemporary administrator would state it with such candor in the more conciliatory atmosphere of the sixties.

Closer to Bartky's position than other junior college administrators writing on the subject of faculty participation in administrative decision-making is Ray A. Howe.³ Howe's conclusions are that teacher militancy must be accepted in community colleges as a fact of life; that we must face "the formalization of many relationships which have traditionally been dealt with informally, if, indeed, they have been dealt with at all"; and that college administrators must become schooled in the techniques of collective bargaining and labor relations, as well as becoming sensitive to the attitudes and

¹Bartky, Junior College Journal, XXXVIII, 7.

²Ibid.

³Howe, Junior College Journal, XXXVII, 14-15.

positions of the teacher organizations on current issues in administration.

Howe's orientation, perhaps the result of a strike which he experienced at his own institution, which arose, he explains, despite a liberal administrative attitude toward faculty involvement in decision-making, is much less conciliatory in tone than the great bulk of the literature written by college administrators who declare themselves anxious to involve their faculties in administrative decision-making.

Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson, though themselves not involved in the issue, summarize some of the general criticisms of the involvement of faculty in administrative decision-making:

1. Increasing specialization makes policy-making a full-time job.
2. Teachers are subject matter oriented and mainly interested in their fields of specialization.
3. Faculty members usually lack information necessary to make policy decisions.
4. Faculties are conservative--resistant to change.
5. Faculty policy-making is inconsistent and piecemeal, unreliable and unstable.¹

On the other hand, the case for faculty participation is stated and re-stated throughout the current literature by many administrators prominent in shaping the philosophy of the junior college movement.

In a speech to the American Association of Junior Colleges at the 45th annual convention, Algo D. Henderson points out the importance of recognizing

¹Blocker, et. al., 188-89.

the essential difference between the college-teacher-administrator and the analogous employer-employee relationship in industry or business.¹ However, Henderson's speech seems comparatively conservative. He apparently sees organizations external to the college administrative structure as the primary organs of faculty influence--the union, AAUP and NEA.

Two commentators who rationalize the necessity for faculty participation in junior college administrative decision-making relate this rationale to the status of junior colleges as part of the higher education establishment.²

Unqualified assertions of the faculty's right and responsibility in administrative decision-making come from Eaton, who generalizes that faculty is in the best position to make many of the decisions regarding the

¹Algo D. Henderson, "Decision Making by Junior College Faculty," School and Society, XCIII (May 1, 1965), 292.

²"However, the assumption will be made here that community colleges are part of higher education and will participate in its folkways and mores, to the extent that they are applicable, and that the area of faculty participation in administration is one in which they are applicable." Rislov, "Faculty Participation in Community College Government," 3.

"First and most fundamental, two-year colleges belong in the category of institutions of higher learning, not in that of secondary schools; they cannot but reflect most aspects of four-year colleges and universities, including those related to the faculty's role in making policy." Norma E. Bentley, "The Role of Faculty in Community College Policy Making," (unpublished manuscript, Cazenovia College, 1966), p. 3.

"To what extent should the faculty of a community college participate in policy making? The answer must be no less and no more than in other institutions of higher learning." Bentley, "The Role of Faculty in Community College Policy Making," p. 5.

educational process¹ and R. C. Richardson, who supports the Lahti subcommittee proposals for involvement of faculty and says, ". . . The involvement of faculty in the decision-making process, in the administrative process, is critical to the success of the two-year college movement."²

Thus, the large number of articles dealing with the role of faculty in administrative decision-making seems to indicate clearly an affirmation of the position that the faculty must play a significant role. This position is clearly indicated not only by many statements of principle in the junior college literature, but by the very presence of articles, plans and reports which take faculty involvement for granted as an accomplished fact.

What institutionalized forms or channels shall such participation take?

The creation of channels through which faculty participation can be expressed is obviously as important as the affirmation that it shall exist, since statements of principle are meaningless without such channels.

As will be clear from the explanation of the manner of grouping responses to the questionnaire in Chapter III, the channels of faculty participation are regarded in this study as two in kind. The first is an unstructured kind of participation or influence--what Blocker and other writers sometimes call the informal organization of the school.³ When such a structure is effective it

¹Miles W. Eaton, "The Role of Faculty in Community College Policy Making," (unpublished manuscript, Orange Coast College, 1966), p. 3.

²R. C. Richardson, Jr., "Policy Formulation in the Two Year College: Renaissance or Revolution?" Junior College Journal, XXXVII (March, 1967), 40-42.

³Blocker, et. al., 193-194.

means that certain individuals influence policy beyond their functional office, through strength of character, unusual ability, influence on others, strategic position, etc. In its ineffective form reliance on an informal channel for the expression of faculty participation in administrative decision-making could be interpreted as mere lipservice conformity to the principle of democratic administration, though this is a bias which is not pursued in this study.

Henderson, as previously seen, conceives that the teacher organizations external to the formal structure of administration are sufficient to serve as a worthy channel of teacher participation. However the inroads of the AFT are still relatively small in junior colleges as may be seen in Chapter IV of this study. Only about 20% of public junior colleges appear to have AAUP chapters, and these are composed of few faculty members.¹ Of all the teacher organizations, the California Junior College Faculty Association would seem to be of greatest influence in junior colleges, though its influence is obviously only statewide. Also, it must be remembered that such organizations as teachers' unions and educational associations, being external to the formal organization of the college, can legitimately endorse and pursue ends antithetical to those of the school organization. The following excerpt from a letter by Dr. John W. Taylor, President of the Board of Junior College District No. 508, County of Cook and State of Illinois, implies this distinction between the Union, an

¹ Report of the Subcommittee on the Role of Faculty in Institutional Policy-Making, p. 12.

organization external to the college with its own ends, and the Faculty Council, and organ created by the college for the expression of faculty opinion on "educational matters":

I agree wholeheartedly that the College administration and the Faculty should cooperate in achieving a common goal, i.e., "the creation of a vital educational system." I do not agree, however, that the Faculty and the Union are one and the same. Apart from the fact that not all members of the faculty are members of the Union, there is the all-important consideration of recognizing the appropriate spokesman on a particular issue.

.
The Board recognizes the Union as the exclusive spokesman for expressing the faculty point of view on salaries, fringe benefits and working conditions. The Board looks to the Faculty Council as the appropriate spokesman for the faculty on other educational matters.¹

A third channel which can convey faculty opinion and influence is suggested by Eaton, who sees the normal divisional or departmental framework as an adequate way for faculty to democratically influence policy in the teaching and curriculum areas.²

Most writers on the subject, however, favor the presence of a faculty council or senate, a standing body, convened regularly to initiate policy discussion and to review administrative action. The composition of such bodies may differ from institution to institution. Rislov suggests that faculties of fifty or under can operate faculty councils of the whole; whereas larger

¹Letter from Dr. Taylor to Mr. Michael Kaufman, President, Bogan Faculty Council, July 25, 1967 (duplicated and distributed to all faculty.)

²Eaton, "The Role of Faculty in Community College Policy Making," 4.

faculties should form representative councils.¹ Schauerman points out that the presence of administrators on the council is more likely in smaller institutions.²

In summary, there are many ways in which a faculty can influence decision-making. Much faculty participation is by means of ad hoc or standing committees convened to advise regarding a particular policy at a particular time. Undoubtedly some real faculty participation arises from serious direct consultation of individual faculty members by administrators. Though so far there has been little written about it, the administrative advisory council is becoming a more prevalent factor in junior college administration.

But by far the most prevalent and most favored structure for the expression of faculty participation is the faculty council or senate.

What particular areas should the faculty function in as advisors or decision-makers?

In answer to this question Rislov suggests that faculty functions in policy-making can be divided into two categories: areas of primary faculty responsibility and areas of faculty influence. Among the former, Rislov lists the following: 1) admissions, 2) graduation requirements, 3) subject matter in courses, 4) methods of instruction, 5) standards of student performance, 6) instructional facilities, 7) social conditions of instructions, such as

¹Rislov, "Faculty Participation in Community College Government," 8.

²Sam Schauerman, "A Survey of Academic Senates in California Junior Colleges," (unpublished manuscript, El Camino College, 1966), p. 4.

academic freedom, etc.

Among the areas where faculty should exert influence are these: 1) student activities, 2) special services to community and students, 3) new programs, 4) appointments, 5) tenure, 6) promotions, 7) dismissals, 8) selection of administrative heads, 9) expansion of facilities, 10) budgeting policies, 11) administrative organization.¹

In addition to those cited by Rislov, Eaton lists additional areas where faculty should be involved: budget and fiscal policy, recruitment, in-service training, salaries, faculty load and assignment of programs.²

A strong case for the major involvement of faculty in building planning is made by Weldon.³

A very ambitious involvement of faculty in high level planning is detailed by Magnis in a discussion of the activities of the Advisory Council at Yuba College, Marysville, California.⁴ Here the faculty initiated policy planning which went to the board on considerations involving an enlargement of the district, a reorganization of the faculty along divisional rather than departmental lines, a new bond issue and the conditions of its redemption, and a new format for the accreditation report. Magnis summarizes: "The three year history of the Advisory Council at Yuba College impressively demonstrated

¹Rislov, "Faculty Participation in Community College Government," 7.

²Eaton, "The Role of Faculty in Community College Policy Making," 3.

³Herbert Weldon, "An Experiment in Faculty Planning," Junior College Journal, XXXV (April, 1965), 28-30.

⁴Robert F. Magnis, "The Advisory Council--Experiment in Democratic Cooperation," Junior College Journal, XXXI (January, 1961), 258-260.

to the administration and to the Governing Board that a faculty could be drawn into policy determination with great profit to the district and the school."¹

In the literature on faculty involvement in administrative decision-making it is apparent that the faculty is deemed competent over a wide gamut of areas of decision, and that the extent of proper influence and control for faculty members in such decision-making is variously conceived from that of absolute determination of policy to that of review and consultation.

What is the present state of faculty-administration relationships and what kind of future can be foreseen for such relationships?

The present state of faculty-administration relationships is a topic of much concern and speculation. It is stated that the American Association of Junior Colleges subcommittee study of the problem came about because of increasing concern about friction between faculty and administration.²

The subcommittee's report of February 28, 1967, digests responses of eleven junior college presidents and fifty selected junior college teachers to the "Guidelines for a Faculty Role in Policy Formulation" distributed and recommended by the committee. Though thirty-eight of the fifty faculty members reported "that they did not believe there was a trend toward increased

¹Ibid., 260.

²Robert E. Lahti, "Faculty Role in Policy Formulation," Junior College Journal, XXXVII (September, 1966), 9-10.

friction in their region,"¹ the tenor of administrators' responses and the manner in which the committee asked its questions reveal that there is little doubt that the committee sees its role as laying down guidelines to allay a potentially dangerous nationwide situation.

That the locus of much of this dissatisfaction is in California is a conclusion of Lombardi, who, along with others, sees this growing pressure for faculty involvement as growing out of the identification of the faculty with the "community of higher education," with expectations of policy-making autonomy based on a conception of the rights and privileges of that community.²

The Report of the American Association for Higher Education Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiations, Campus Governance Program, states candidly the evaluation by the committee of the present state of faculty-administration relationships:

Faculty discontent recently has become evident in institutions of higher education in the United States.

The main sources of discontent are the faculty's desire to participate in the determination of those policies that affect its professional status and performance and in the establishment of complex, statewide systems of higher education that have decreased local control over important campus issues.

Economic factors, such as salary level and structure, have contributed to faculty discontent, but appear to be of secondary importance.

¹Report of the Subcommittee on the Role of Faculty in Institutional Policy-Making, p. 4.

²Lombardi, Junior College Journal, XXXVII, 10.

The main centers of faculty discontent are in the public junior colleges and the new or "emerging" four year colleges and universities. (emphasis mine)¹

Whatever the imputed cause--increased market value of the teacher, recruitment of staff from college and university oriented teachers, growing organizational militancy, the struggle of the individual for assertion of self in a bureaucratic organization, or, as has been suggested, the very situation of a junior college teacher, who has no real outlet for articulate expression of his talents except institutional politics--whatever the cause, the consensus seems to be that faculty-administration relationships are, if not strained, then in such question that much attention is being paid by administrators all over the country to avoid foreseeable confrontation and struggle.)

There are two major previous studies of the extent of faculty participation in policy-making in public junior colleges.

The first, an unpublished doctoral dissertation by Tunnell,² involves the submission of an identical questionnaire to an administrator and faculty member in each of 224 participating public junior colleges. The questionnaire requires that the participant determine the extent of faculty involvement in policy-making regarding fifty-three administrative duties, subdivisions of six major areas of administration. The administrative duties constitute

¹American Association for Higher Education, Faculty Participation in Academic Governance, Report of the AAHE Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiations, Campus Governance Program (Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1967), p. 1. This report was published too late for extensive use in this study, but it is a very clear and valuable treatment of the subject.

²James Wesley Tunnell, "Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation in the Public Junior College," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Dept. of Education, Texas Technological College), 1963.

a "validated" list selected by experts in the field of administration as activities in which faculty participation in policy-making is highly desirable.

Tunnell's treatment of the data involves two approaches:

The first approach involved a comparison of junior colleges administrator and faculty member perceptions as to the extent and process of faculty involvement in policy formulation, with the data classified according to the size of the participating colleges. The second approach involved the classification of data according to the types of control under which the participating institutions operated.¹

Among other generalizations Tunnell concludes that, "Junior college administrators viewed the faculty as more involved in policy formulation than did the faculty members themselves."² Another conclusion pertinent to the present study is that "Faculty members from county-controlled institutions reported more extensive involvement than did faculty members from other institutional control types."³

Data abstracted from Tunnell's study is shown in the accompanying tables. Table 1 indicates the percentage of administrators reporting faculty involvement in policy making according to the size of college. Colleges are designated small (0-499 enrollment), medium-sized (500-999), and large (1000 and up). Degree of involvement is characterized as full involvement (F), moderate involvement (M), limited involvement (L), and no involvement (N).

Table 2 indicates the same data reported for a sub-behavior of the general category "Teacher Personnel Practices"--"Revising the Salary Schedule for the Faculty."

Table 3 indicates the percentage of faculty members reporting faculty

¹Ibid., 19.

²Ibid., 98.

³Ibid., 99.

involvement in policy making according to type of institutional control. Tunnell's categories of control are state (S), county (C), district (D), and local (L).

Percentages do not equal 100 because of the discarding of unusable responses or because some respondents omitted part of the data requested.

Of particular interest are Tunnell's data regarding the relationship of size of enrollment and of kind of legal control to the extent of faculty involvement in policy making, because such considerations are part of the present study. However, there are problems in comparing Tunnell's data with the latter study. Much of this difficulty arises from the kinds of categories into which Tunnell divides his responses to his questionnaire. He designates small colleges as those under 500 in enrollment, medium-sized colleges as those with enrollment under 1000. In the present study colleges are grouped as either under or over the median enrollment for all colleges in the study. The consideration of colleges with under 500 in enrollment seems of limited use since there are few such colleges and the trend is definitely toward campuses approaching the 5000-10,000 enrollment figure. The median college enrollment in this study is over 2000. However, an examination of the distribution of responses in Table 1 clearly reveals that Tunnell has found a positive relationship between institutional size and extent of faculty participation in policy making. Particularly to be noted is the difference between the number of those reporting limited or no faculty involvement in policy making in small colleges (total mean percentage 41.9) and those in large colleges (27.8).

In considering Tunnell's treatment of the data by type of institutional control, there are still other problems. Tunnell's categories of control

TABLE 1 ^a

PERCENTAGE OF ADMINISTRATORS REPORTING FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN POLICY MAKING IN
JUNIOR COLLEGES ACCORDING TO SIZE OF COLLEGE

	LARGE COLLEGES				MED-SIZED COLLEGES				SMALL COLLEGES			
	F	M	L	N	F	M	L	N	F	M	L	N
TEACHER PERSONNEL PRACTICES	16	31	27	16	13	20	26	26	11	26	31	28
CURRICULUM	41	25	15	8	36	25	9	13	41	25	18	15
COLLEGE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS	9	22	15	20	11	30	16	25	11	26	27	31
BUILDING AND PLANT	53	25	9	6	55	23	9	13	33	32	16	16
BUDGETING	47	30	10	8	53	26	14	5	38	21	22	15
STUDENT PERSONNEL PRACTICES	23	37	22	11	30	38	14	13	28	37	19	13
MEAN PERCENTAGE	31.5	28.3	16.3	11.5	33	27	14.7	15.8	27	27.8	22.2	19.7

^a Data abstracted from Tunnell, Tables 1-18.

TABLE 2^a

PERCENTAGE OF ADMINISTRATORS REPORTING FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN POLICY MAKING
IN JUNIOR COLLEGES ACCORDING TO SIZE OF COLLEGE IN THE SPECIFIC AREA OF
SALARY SCHEDULE REVISION

LARGE COLLEGES				MEDIUM SIZED COLLEGES				SMALL COLLEGES			
F	M	L	N	F	M	L	N	F	M	L	N
34	29	18	11	15	30	21	30	15	26	27	27

^aData abstracted from Tunnel, Tables 1, 7, 13.

TABLE 3^a

PERCENTAGE OF ADMINISTRATORS REPORTING FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN POLICY MAKING
ACCORDING TO TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL

	STATE				COUNTY				DISTRICT				LOCAL			
	F	M	L	N	F	M	L	N	F	M	L	N	F	M	L	N
TEACHER PERSONNEL PRACTICES	10	19	27	35	13	24	22	31	13	19	21	34	7	19	22	40
CURRICULUM	33	25	9	22	46	18	13	15	36	20	15	19	35	20	10	16
COMMUNITY COLLEGE RELATIONS	6	15	22	40	15	15	18	43	5	13	19	48	9	11	20	44
BUILDING AND PLANT	32	27	14	12	30	28	22	14	30	34	16	15	17	32	21	21
BUDGET	26	14	25	21	43	19	19	11	33	18	17	24	19	23	22	29
STUDENT PERSONNEL PRACTICES	28	25	11	25	27	29	25	19	16	26	27	24	17	28	27	18
MEAN PERCENTAGE	22.5	20.8	18	25.8	28.8	22.2	19.8	22.2	22.2	21.7	19.2	26.5	17.3	22.2	21.8	28

^aData abstracted from Tunnell, Tables 19-24.

(state, county, district, local) are not defined. Moreover, they do not correspond to the kinds of control used by the American Association of Junior Colleges in its yearbook. The designation "county control" seems meaningful primarily in Texas schools, but it is this category of control which seems to provide the maximum degree of faculty involvement in policy making according to Table 3. A further problem lies in distinguishing "district" from "local" control.

The American Association of Junior Colleges research, the Report of the Subcommittee on the Role of Faculty in Institutional Policy-Making, has been referred to previously. This study is in the form of fourteen questions relating to the presence or absence of faculty councils, administrative advisory councils, and AAUP chapters, and inquiry is made as to the function of these groups. Out of 217 responding campuses 116 reported a faculty council.¹ More significantly, the percentage of faculty councils in responding institutions became greater in those with over 1000 enrollment, than in smaller institutions.²

Both major studies referred to above are useful, though neither easily serves as a basis for broad generalizations about the extent of faculty participation in administrative policy-making in public junior colleges. The reader of these studies can conclude generally that there is very evident faculty participation in many decision-making areas. Whether such participation

¹Report of the Subcommittee on the Role of the Faculty in Institutional Policy-Making, p. 9.

²Ibid.

as shown in these studies is adequate to an optimally functioning educational institution is, of course, a judgmental rather than an investigative problem. The Tunnell study is particularly useful because of Tunnell's use of the fifty-three administrative behaviors in his check list. The extent of faculty participation in these behaviors is checked individually by each responding institution and the reader can use the tabulation as a kind of norm. Thus, if one wishes to consider, for example, what should be the faculty participation in compiling and publishing the annual report of the college, the Tunnell study tells him that "full involvement" in such activities takes place in about 10% of the colleges in Tunnell's Sample, "no involvement" in 40-50%, etc.

Two other studies deserve mention. Both have been previously referred to. Schauerman¹ found the faculty senate almost universally present in his California study. He also concluded that, "The involvement of an administrator in the senate, even in an ex-officio capacity, was found in the smaller institutions exclusively."²

The American Association for Higher Education study, Faculty Participation in Academic Governance, is based empirically on visits by the committee to thirty-four institutions including twelve junior colleges. Though this study is not a statistical research report, its generalizations are so clearly stated and it is so incisively written in every respect that it is of great value to all interested in the problems under study.

¹"A Survey of Academic Senates in California Junior Colleges."

²Ibid., 4.

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF THIS STUDY

As previously stated, the primary investigative technique employed in this study is a questionnaire submitted to each of the public junior colleges, listed in the 1967 Directory American Association of Junior Colleges, in nine states: California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, Mississippi, New York, Texas, and Washington.

The data obtained through this questionnaire are applied to the testing of eighteen hypotheses concerning the extent of faculty participation in certain areas of administrative decision-making and the relationship of certain institutional characteristics to the extent of faculty participation.

The discussion in Chapter II has focused upon the background of this problem and will furnish a frame of reference within which to discuss the results of the questionnaire and to draw implications.

It now remains in Chapter III to explain the nature of the questionnaire, in Chapter IV to analyze the data, and in Chapter V to draw conclusions and implications from the questionnaire study.

The questionnaire was designed to draw information from the respondents with respect to seven areas of administrative decision-making: teachers' salaries, class size and teacher load, student personnel policy, curriculum, buildings and space utilization, appointment and tenure of teachers, and

appointment of department chairmen and administrators. These categories represent an arbitrary choice of areas of major importance and major concern to teachers. They parallel rather closely the categories investigated by Tunnell, whose study has previously been referred to. Tunnell's categories were arrived at through consultation with educational experts who considered these administrative behaviors of prime importance.

The selection of public rather than private junior colleges for the study derives from the same reason as in the Tunnell study--their predominance numerically and in terms of population served.¹

The nine states in the study were chosen for very definite reasons. California, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Texas and Washington are the only states listed in the 1967 Directory American Association of Junior Colleges which have over 20,000 students in public junior colleges. Moreover, the first six of these seven states are the acknowledged leaders in junior college education according to many professionals in the field. Colorado and Mississippi were added to give some geographical balance to the selection of states and because Colorado has a system of state control of colleges which could add a useful variant to the factors under consideration.

The questionnaire itself is reproduced in Appendix A. It was submitted along with the covering letter included in Appendix B to the chief executives of all public junior colleges listed in the states under consideration. In addition to questions about the extent of faculty participation the chief executives were requested to furnish population information and other

¹Tunnell, 7.

statistical data about their campuses. One hundred sixty out of 266, or about 60% of the chief executives, responded.

The questionnaire was then resubmitted to all of the institutions which had not responded, directed this time to presidents of faculty councils in California and to chairmen of English departments in other states. Covering letters for these submissions are included in Appendix C and Appendix D respectively. Obviously these procedures require an explanation.

The questionnaire was resubmitted to obtain as great a response as possible from the states under study. In California one could assume the presence of a faculty senate in virtually every college, and further assume sufficient interest on the part of the presidents of these senates to encourage their response to our questionnaire. In other states the chairman of the English department was chosen arbitrarily.

It will be pointed out that such a procedure presupposes that chief executives, chairmen of English departments, and California faculty senate presidents constitute a homogeneous population with regard to their propensities to answer the questionnaire. In fact, however, Tunnell investigates the variation in perception of faculty on the one hand and administrators on the other as to the extent of faculty participation in policy making and concludes, "Junior college administrators viewed the faculty as more involved in policy formulation than did the faculty members themselves."¹

Moreover, an examination of the 60 answers received from faculty members tends to confirm Tunnell's conclusion. There is a real difference between

¹Tunnell, 98.

the degree of participation indicated in institutions from which faculty members responded (less participation is indicated) and those in which administrators responded (greater participation is indicated).

What justification is made, then, for the procedure of tabulating both sets of responses as if they came from a single population?

First, the major interest was in the responses of institutions, not of individuals. Even some of the "administrator responses" were delegated to others, as was apparent from the responses themselves.

Secondly, it was assumed that variance in the study might arise from the tendency of chief executives in schools where faculty participation is low to refuse to participate in the study. This is at least possible in a climate where support of faculty participation is a popular posture in educational circles.

Thirdly, an attempt was made to structure the possible responses to the questionnaire in such a way, as shall be explained, that insofar as possible the same response would be anticipated, no matter what position the respondent might hold.

Finally, even assuming that there is a variation in the tendency to characterize faculty participation between administrators and faculty, there is no more reason to assume validity of administrators' responses than of faculty members'.

A word should be said about the processing of the responses. The answers to each question were evaluated by placing the response into one of four categories:

1. Faculty does not participate in decision-making.

2. Faculty participates informally in decision-making. This category would include situations where there is no faculty committee involved but where administrators talk things over with individuals, publish proposed policies soliciting responses from faculty, frame policy with the advice of department chairmen (who are quasi-administrators) and other informal procedures.

3. Faculty participates formally in decision-making in an advisory capacity. This category covers situations where there is a faculty committee which comes up with the definite report or recommendation which then must be accepted or rejected by administrators.

4. Faculty participates formally in decision-making and controls policy to some significant degree. This category could include a number of kinds of situations. In some colleges in the study, for instance, faculty controls curriculum through a committee structure. In colleges with collective bargaining contracts faculty could be said to exercise a degree of control in all areas which are aspects of the bargaining contract.

Those situations where faculty participates formally are considered as exhibiting a greater degree of participation than those situations where faculty serves in an informal consultative capacity through individual communication with decision-making administrators or in some other way. In situations where there is a faculty committee structure the administrator is at least forced to consider and formally reject faculty counsel, if he disagrees with it. In an informal situation he can ignore it. This position is supported by the authors of the American Association for Higher Education report, who state:

Endorsement of the principle of faculty representation, by itself, will have little impact on campus governance and administration. To be effective, this statement of principle must be supported by the establishment of formal organizational arrangements designed to involve the faculty in decision-making in key substantive areas.¹

After keying the responses from each institution in terms of these four categories, those institutions which responded with four or more of their answers to the first seven questions in categories one or two were characterized as "low participation" institutions. If the majority of the responses were in categories three or four, the institutions were characterized as "high participation" institutions. The pattern of response for each institution was almost always heavy in one direction. That is, in a "high participation" institution the tendency would be for five or six high participation responses rather than merely four out of seven.

¹Faculty Participation in Academic Governance, 33.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The data of this study will be analyzed in terms of its relevance to the twenty hypotheses set forth in Chapter I.

1. Public junior colleges are characterized by a high degree of faculty participation in general administrative decision-making.

Faculty participation as stated in hypothesis one is defined as participation of the kind included under categories three and four of the structured responses to the questionnaire--that is, participation in an advisory or controlling capacity through some kind of definite formal structure.

In Table 4 the responses to the seven initial questions in the questionnaire are tabulated by category and state.¹ Thus, 1% of California institutions answering the questionnaire reported no participation in decision-making regarding salary, 77% reported formal participation in an advisory capacity, etc. The last row labeled "Total" breaks down the responses from the nine states by totaling all responses in each category and computing percentages of the total. If the responses in categories three and four are added for each of the seven questions, it is noted that in each case save one the responses

¹Data is rounded to the nearest percent, thus yielding totals of 99% or 101% in some cases.

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE IN EACH CATEGORY ARRANGED BY STATE

	Salary				Class Size				Student Personnel Practices				Curriculum				Buildings				Teacher Selection				Administrator Selection			
	No Partic.	Inf. Partic.	Form. Advisory	Form Control	No Partic.	Inf. Partic.	Form. Advisory	Form Control	No Partic.	Inf. Partic.	Form. Advisory	Form Control	No Partic.	Inf. Partic.	Form. Advisory	Form Control	No Partic.	Inf. Partic.	Form. Advisory	Form Control	No Partic.	Inf. Partic.	Form. Advisory	Form. Control	No Partic.	Inf. Partic.	Form. Advisory	Form. Control
Calif.	1	5	77	17	0	24	72	4	7	23	68	1	0	8	86	6	1	19	76	3	8	23	61	8	19	17	40	23
Colo.	0	57	43	0	0	71	29	0	0	14	57	29	0	0	43	57	0	57	43	0	0	29	71	0	57	29	0	14
Fla.	47	26	26	0	37	21	42	0	11	5	74	11	0	6	72	22	0	47	47	5	56	22	22	0	68	21	11	0
Ill.	5	0	64	32	14	23	50	14	9	14	77	0	0	18	68	14	10	43	48	0	32	18	50	0	62	10	29	0
Mich.	5	15	15	65	5	10	35	50	15	10	70	5	0	0	80	20	15	20	65	0	20	20	45	15	50	10	25	15
Miss.	57	7	29	7	21	29	50	0	8	23	62	8	0	10	80	10	10	50	40	0	40	30	30	0	58	33	8	0
N.Y.	29	37	26	7	18	21	57	4	0	0	71	29	0	8	62	31	19	29	48	4	7	22	63	7	39	10	36	14
Texas	64	20	16	0	40	32	28	0	24	12	60	4	4	33	54	8	13	46	37	4	21	33	42	4	79	17	4	0
Wash.	6	12	29	53	6	24	59	12	6	18	65	12	0	13	88	0	6	19	75	0	25	19	50	6	41	24	18	18
Total	21	15	44	20	14	25	53	9	9	15	68	8	0	11	74	15	7	31	59	2	20	24	52	4	45	17	25	12

in these categories are over 50% of the total response to the question; in the case of student personnel practices as high as 76%; in curriculum 89%.

Table 5 is a list by state of the percentage of responses from each state which fell into each of the four response categories. The final row, "Totals," gives this data for all the colleges combined. Note that 54% of all responses fell into category three, formal advisory participation, and 10% in category four, control of decision-making. Only 16% of the total responses were in the "no participation" category.

TABLE 5
PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES BY STATE
IN EACH CATEGORY

	No Partic.	Inf. Partic.	Form Adv.	Form. Cont.
Calif	5	17	70	9
Colo	8	39	39	14
Fla	31	21	42	5
Ill	18	18	55	9
Mich	11	13	51	26
Miss	29	25	42	4
N.Y.	16	18	52	14
Texas	35	27	35	3
Wash	11	19	56	<u>15</u>
Totals	16	20	54	10

Table 6 lists by state the number of public junior colleges in each state in the study according to 1967 Directory American Association of Junior Colleges, the number of institutions responding to the questionnaire in each state, and the percentage of such institutions falling into the high participation and low participation categories.¹ Sixty-nine percent of all institutions responding were high participation institutions. In only two of the nine states did the percentage of high participation institutions fall below 50%, and in six of the nine states the percentage of high participation institutions ranged from 60% to 80%.

The major hypothesis is accepted: Public junior colleges are characterized by a high degree of faculty participation in general administrative decision-making.

2. Faculty participates in decision-making regarding salary.

Table 4 reveals that 44% of the responses to the question regarding participation in salary decisions could be grouped in category three, formal participation in an advisory capacity. Many responding institutions wrote on the questionnaire that such participation involved a standing or specially convened salary committee. Twenty percent of the responding institutions reported that salary matters were at least partially controlled by faculty. This is the highest percentage of responses in category four to any of the

¹Two hundred twenty-five out of a potential 266 responded. However, seven were incomplete and could not be designated as high or low participation, and five were too late to be tabulated.

questions. It should be explained that any response that indicated that salary was a matter of collective bargaining was grouped as a category four response. In a real sense the party to a collective bargaining agreement exercises control over salary matters--as much as can be exerted in this kind of employer-employee relationship. The total response of 64% in categories three and four justified the acceptance of the second hypothesis: Faculty participates in decision-making regarding salary.

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES IN HIGH AND LOW PARTICIPATION CATEGORIES BY STATE

	J.S.'s in State	No. respond.	% High	% Low
Calif	77	66	85%	15%
Colo	7	7	71%	29%
Fla	25	19	58%	42%
Ill	28	22	68%	32%
Mich	23	20	80%	20%
Miss	20	12	25%	75%
N.Y.	34	27	74%	26%
Texas	34	24	33%	67%
Wash	18	16	75%	25%
Totals	266	213	69%	31%

3. Faculty participates in decision-making regarding class size and teacher load.

According to Table 4 62% of the responses to the question regarding class size and teacher load fell into the high participation categories. This degree of high participation is fourth highest of all the seven areas of participation investigated and is sufficient to justify accepting the third hypothesis: Faculty participates in decision-making regarding class size and teacher load.

4. Faculty participates in decision-making regarding probation, admission, withdrawal, student discipline, and other student personnel practices.

Table 4 shows that 76% of the total responses to the question relating to student personnel practices were in categories three or four. Though it is not possible to compare directly the categories in Tunnell's study, listed in Table 1, with those in the present study, it would appear that the present study shows somewhat more involvement in the area of student personnel services than does Tunnell's. The degree of faculty participation in student personnel decision-making is second only to that in curriculum, according to Table 4, thus affirming the fourth hypothesis: Faculty participates in decision-making regarding probation, admission, withdrawal, student discipline, and other student personnel practices.

5. Faculty participates in decision-making regarding the introduction of new curricula and the modification of existing curricula.

Table 4 indicates that 74% of responses were in category three and 15% in category four to the question on faculty participation in curriculum development and modification. Faculty participation is highest in the area of

curriculum of all the areas considered in the study. Tunnell, according to Table 1, found it second to participation in decisions regarding building and plant. No institution in the present study responded "no participation" in curriculum decision-making. Many institutions among the 11% reporting informal participation wrote on the questionnaire that their faculty participated in curriculum decisions through a committee chaired by the Dean of Instruction and composed of departmental chairmen. These were classified as limited in participation because the investigator views the department chairman as a quasi-administrator. The hypothesis is affirmed by the data: Faculty participates in decision-making regarding the introduction of new curricula and the modification of existing curricula.

6. Faculty participates in decision-making regarding the construction of new buildings, the remodeling of existing facilities, space allocation and room use.

Table 4 indicates that 61% of the responses to the question concerning faculty participation in decisions about buildings and plant were in categories three and four. The data justifies the acceptance of the hypothesis: Faculty participates in decision-making regarding the construction of new buildings, the remodeling of existing facilities, space allocation, and room use.

7. Faculty participates in decision-making regarding the appointment of new teachers and the granting of tenure.

Twenty percent of the respondents to the questionnaire indicated no participation in either the appointment of new teachers or the granting of tenure to probationary teachers. Many of those responding indicated that such

matters were completely covered by board policy, at least in the case of tenure. Only 52% reported formal advisory participation in such decisions, and only 4% indicated any degree of control. The conclusion would be the following: Faculty participates in decision-making regarding the appointment of new teachers and the granting of tenure to a limited degree.

8. Faculty participates in decision-making regarding the appointment of department chairmen and administrators.

Clearly faculty participation in this kind of decision is very limited. Forty-five percent of the respondents (more than twice the number in any of the other areas covered by the questionnaire) indicated no participation in decisions regarding the appointment of chairmen and administrators. Only 37% responded in category three or four. The conclusion is that faculty participation in decision-making regarding the appointment of department chairmen and administrators is very limited.

9. The extent of faculty participation is related to the state in which the college is located.

Tables 4, 5, and 6 clearly exhibit a wide variation in the institutions grouped by state. The range of high participation institutions is from 85% in California to 25% in Mississippi. The three lowest percentages of high participation institutions are in the three southern states in the study: Florida, Texas, and Mississippi.

The state with the greatest number of responses in category four, indicating that faculty controls policy, is Michigan, with 26% of total responses in this category. Michigan reports the greatest number of bargaining contracts in public junior colleges, a fact which is undoubtedly connected with

its greater number of category four responses. Yet even within this state there is variation from one area of decision-making to another. Table 4 reveals that no college in Michigan failed to report faculty participation in curriculum decisions of a formal advisory or formal controlling type (categories three or four). Yet, the state ranks below California and New York in the percentage of high participation responses in choosing administrators or department chairmen.

Similarly, in looking at the data for Mississippi in Table 4 it is noted that this state ranks lowest in its ratio of high participation to low participation institutions; yet, it ranks higher in the "salary" category than Florida, New York and Texas; higher in the "class size" category than Florida, Colorado and Texas; and higher than Illinois in the "curriculum" category.

In short, much variation is seen between states both with regard to the ratio of high to low participation institutions and with regard to the degree of participation in specific areas of decision-making.

The ninth hypothesis is, consequently, affirmed: Faculty participation is related in extent to the state in which the college is located.

Hypotheses 10-20, with the exception of hypothesis 18, are tested by means of a chi square test for independence of variables, at a .05 level of confidence.

10. The extent of faculty participation is related to the size of the town in which the college is located.

Table 7 indicates the division of colleges into four groups. Rows represent high participation and low participation institutions. Columns refer to whether an institution is in a city above 50,000 in population or below

50,000, as determined by its response to the questionnaire. The population figure of 50,000 was arbitrarily chosen as representing the figure at which a small town begins to be more cosmopolitan. This figure is slightly below the median for institutions represented in Table 7. The purpose in framing this hypothesis was to test the effect of a more cosmopolitan cultural and intellectual environment, the presence of stronger industrial and labor organizations and of a competitive job market--all to be expected in a larger city.

TABLE 7

RELATIONSHIP OF SIZE OF CITY TO FACULTY PARTICIPATION

	Under 50,000	Over 50,000	Total
High Participation	69	77	146
Low Participation	44	23	67
Total	113	100	213

The test yields a chi square significant beyond the .02 confidence level. The direction of the relationship is to indicate an association between high participation and cities over 50,000 in population. The tenth hypothesis is accepted: The extent of faculty participation is related to the size of the town in which the college is located.

11. The extent of faculty participation is related to the size of enrollment.

Table 8 indicates the division of institutions into four groups: rows represent high and low participation institutions; columns represent pupil enrollments for 1966-67 as given in the 1967 Directory American Association of Junior Colleges, divided into those above and below the median enrollment figure for all public junior colleges in the states included in the study (2,357). Those who answered the questionnaire tended to place slightly below the median figure.

TABLE 8

RELATIONSHIP OF SIZE OF ENROLLMENT TO FACULTY PARTICIPATION

	Under Median	Over Median	Total
High Participation	69	86	155
Low Participation	46	19	65
Total	115	105	220

This data yields a chi square significant beyond the .001 level of confidence. An examination of the table shows that the larger institutions tend to be high participation to a greater degree.

The eleventh hypothesis is accepted. The extent of faculty participation is related to the size of enrollment.

12. The extent of faculty participation is related to the ratio of full-time to part-time teachers.

To test this hypothesis an arbitrary proportion of one-third was chosen as a criterion and colleges were grouped into those with one-third or more teachers on their total staff on part-time status and those with less than one-third on such status.

Table 9 shows that a larger percentage of responding institutions fell into the under one-third category than into the over one-third. Those institutions with fewer part-time teachers proportionally tended to be high participation. However, a chi square test yields a result at the 20% confidence level--short of the criterion. The hypothesis is rejected, and a conclusion is drawn that faculty participation is not related to the ratio of full-time to part-time teachers.

TABLE 9

RELATIONSHIP OF RATIO OF FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME TEACHERS TO
FACULTY PARTICIPATION

	Under 1/3	Over 1/3	Total
High participation	83	60	143
Low participation	44	21	65
Total	127	81	208

13. The extent of faculty participation is related to the source of recruitment of teachers.

Table 10 shows the division of responses into four groups. Columns in the table refer to the source of teacher recruitment. The first column represents institutions with half or more of their teachers recruited from

secondary or primary school teachers. The institutions numbered in the second column are those with over half of their staff recruited directly from graduate schools or sources other than the secondary and primary school. A chi square test shows significance at the .02 confidence level. Institutions with a larger proportion of their staff from sources other than the common schools tend to be high participation. The differing expectations of these groups of teachers have already been discussed in Chapter I. The hypothesis is accepted: The extent of faculty participation is related to the source of recruitment of teachers.

TABLE 10

RELATIONSHIP OF SOURCE OF TEACHER RECRUITMENT TO
FACULTY PARTICIPATION

	Over 50% from common schools	Under 50% from common schools	Total
High Participation	49	88	137
Low Participation	31	26	57
Total	80	114	194

14. The extent of faculty participation is related to the kind of legal control exercised over the college.

Responding institutions were grouped into four categories of legal control corresponding to those used in American Junior Colleges: unit districts (combined common schools and junior colleges), junior college districts, state junior college, branch of a four year institution. Some responding institutions had difficulty in grouping themselves under these four categories, because of

local conditions.

Clearly the trend in recent years has been toward the formation of independent junior college districts. The tabulations in Table 11 show about four-fifths of all responding institutions in this category. Hypothesis fourteen was framed from the point of view that unit districts might tend to exhibit a lesser degree of faculty participation because of more inhibiting board rules and policies relating to the lower schools. Though the number of institutions in other categories is small, chi square was computed for this data. No significant relationship between kind of legal control and degree of faculty participation in administrative decision-making was found. The hypothesis that the extent of faculty participation is related to the kind of legal control exercised over the college is rejected.

15. The extent of faculty participation is related to the kind of physical facilities occupied by the college.

The kinds of alternative facilities described to the respondents to the questionnaire were the following: separate junior college facilities, shared facilities with secondary schools, and shared facilities with colleges. Such a

TABLE 11

RELATIONSHIP OF KIND OF LEGAL CONTROL TO FACULTY PARTICIPATION

	Unit Dist.	J.C. Dist.	State	Branch	Totals
High Participation	20	117	7	1	145
Low Participation	10	47	55	0	62
Totals	30	164	12	1	207

preponderance of institutions, as shown in Table 12, responded by indicating that they occupied separate junior college facilities, that the question itself is hardly significant. In fact the only kinds of facilities occupied except for separate facilities were shared with secondary schools. A chi square test of the variables shows no relationship with degree of faculty participation, and the hypothesis is rejected and a conclusion drawn that degree of faculty participation is not related to the kind of facility occupied by the college.

16. The extent of faculty participation is related to the presence or absence of a faculty council or senate.

Table 13 shows the division of responding institutions into those which reported the presence of a faculty council or senate and those which did not. One hundred seventy-four of 217 institutions answering questions 7 on the

TABLE 12

RELATIONSHIP OF KIND OF PHYSICAL FACILITY TO FACULTY PARTICIPATION

	J.C. Building	Shared High Schl.	Shared Col.	Totals
High Participation	133	10	0	143
Low Participation	61	4	0	65
Totals	194	14	0	208

questionnaire reported a faculty council. In the study by the subcommittee of the American Association of Junior Colleges which has been referred to several times 53% of the 217 public institutions responding reported faculty councils, as opposed to 80% in the present study. No attempt is made to account for this variation; part may be accounted for by the growth in faculty participation since the AAJC study.

In the present study California was the state with the greatest number of faculty councils and the greatest proportion--only one California institution reported no faculty council. It has been previously pointed out that faculty option for a faculty council is mandated in California.

TABLE 13

RELATIONSHIP OF FACULTY COUNCIL TO FACULTY PARTICIPATION

	Fac. Council	No. Fac. Council	Totals
High Participation	134	18	152
Low Participation	40	25	65
Totals	174	43	217

The data in Table 13 were tested and the variables are found to be related beyond the .001 level of confidence, in a direction relating the presence of a faculty council with high participation. The conclusion is that the hypothesis is true: The extent of faculty participation is related to the presence or absence of a faculty council or senate.

17. The extent of faculty participation is related to the presence or absence of a collective bargaining agent, recognized by the board.

Thirty-six percent of the institutions responding to question 8 of the questionnaire indicated that their boards recognized bargaining agents for faculty. A chi square test of the data in Table 14 indicates relatedness of the presence of a designated bargaining agent to high participation to the .05 level of confidence. The hypothesis is accepted: The extent of faculty participation is related to the presence or absence of a collective bargaining agent, recognized by the board.

TABLE 14

RELATIONSHIP OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGENT TO FACULTY PARTICIPATION

	Bargaining Agent	No Bargaining Agent	Total
High partic.	58	82	140
Low partic.	16	48	64
Total	74	130	204

18. The extent of faculty participation is related to the affiliation of the bargaining agent.

The data in Table 15 indicates that one AFT affiliated bargaining agent was reported by a low participation institutions, and a larger proportion of low participation units were reported in the other two affiliation categories. The institutions in the "Other" category were for the most part independent teacher organizations without any national affiliation. Because of the small

numbers in these categories no chi square test was performed nor conclusion drawn as to whether to accept or reject the eighteenth hypothesis.

TABLE 15

RELATIONSHIP OF AFFILIATION OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGENT TO FACULTY PARTICIPATION

	AFT	NEA	Other	Total
High Part.	9	18	30	57
Low Part.	1	7	7	15
Total	10	25	37	72

19. The extent of faculty participation is related to the presence or absence of a collective bargaining agreement or contract.

As indicated in Table 16, twenty-seven institutions reported collective bargaining contracts. Twenty of these were in the state of Michigan. Though a chi square test showed the relationship of the variable of the presence of a contract to be related to high participation beyond the .20 confidence level, this was not sufficient to meet the confidence level criterion. Consequently the hypothesis that the extent of faculty participation is related to the presence or absence of a collective bargaining agreement or contract is rejected.

20. The extent of faculty participation is related to the presence or absence of board rules providing for such participation.

TABLE 16

RELATIONSHIP OF A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONTRACT TO FACULTY PARTICIPATION

	Contract	No Contract	Totals
High Participation	21	106	127
Low Participation	6	58	64
Totals	27	164	191

Table 17 shows the relationship of the variable of board rules encouraging participation to the extent of faculty participation. This data yielded the highest chi square in the study, far beyond the .001 confidence level, clearly showing a strong relationship between high participation and board rules encouraging such participation.

It was requested that institutions responding positively to question 11 on the questionnaire indicate briefly the nature of the specific board rules encouraging faculty participation. These rules ranged from board policy affirmations of the state code in California and New York to independently formulated recognition of faculty roles in institutional governance and board directives establishing joint board-faculty committees.

TABLE 17
RELATIONSHIP OF BOARD RULES TO FACULTY PARTICIPATION

	Board Rules	No Board Rules	Totals
High Participation	89	53	142
Low Participation	16	47	63
Totals	105	100	205

The hypothesis is accepted: The extent of faculty participation is related to the presence or absence of board rules providing for such participation.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The analysis of the data in the previous chapter has established a definite, and in the opinion of the writer a strong element of faculty participation in administrative decision-making in the colleges under study. This participation has been shown to be related to certain variables characteristic of these institutions. One of the most important of these variables is the state in which the institution is located. It may well be that many of the other variables shown to be closely related to a high degree of faculty participation are ultimately reducible to this variable of the state in which the college is located. Nature of legal control, size, the option to bargain collectively with labor unions, the nature of the physical plant, and many other gross characteristics of a public junior college are keyed to the actions of the state legislature.

Among the other variables which proved to be related to a high degree of faculty participation were size of town, size of enrollment, source of teacher recruitment, the presence of a faculty council, the presence of a collective bargaining agent, and, most importantly, the presence of board rules providing for such participation.

It goes without saying that nowhere in this study has an attempt been

made to designate causal relationships between the factors investigated and a high degree of faculty participation. Clearly such an effort to attribute causal connections would be tentative only, in view of the complexity of the phenomenon. Even in the case of the very clear and strong relationship between the presence of board rules encouraging faculty participation and the presence of a high degree of participation, cause is not clearly established. Stated board policy may be nothing more than a recognition of a fait accompli, though not necessarily so. Such policy may reflect administrative thinking, state law, the social ethic of a labor state such as Michigan, or other causes. And certainly there is an obvious interrelatedness of the factors associated with faculty participation in administrative decision-making.

One can, however, sketch a model of the kind of institution in which high participation would be expected. It would be typically a large institution, on the east or west coast, in a large town, with access for teacher recruitment to a large university. Such an institution would have structured teacher organizations as a channel for faculty participation. These organizations would certainly be internal--the faculty council or senate--and very likely external also--the AAUP or teachers' union.

Implications for Further Study

Having summarized briefly the results of the study, one might profitably ask what questions are raised for further investigation and thought about teacher participation in decision-making in public junior colleges.

Certainly the primary and most difficult question to be answered is the relationship of such participation to quality education and to institutional

efficiency and "health." Justification for extensive faculty participation in administrative decision-making should be sought in the expediency of the policy. Besides being a concession to sometimes irresistible and organized teacher demand, what is the educational value of shared decision-making by faculty and administration? How does it reflect in the classroom?

A second area of investigation is suggested by the remarks in Chapter I concerning the particular inclination of many teachers in junior colleges to share what might be considered mundane or "housekeeping" kinds of administrative decisions. It was suggested that the junior college teacher might be forced to express his professional aggressiveness and talent through the medium of local campus "politics," since the traditional avenues of professional ambition for college teachers--publication and research--are closed to the junior college teacher in most cases. Studies of teacher characteristics in the future might well focus upon the relationship of teacher personality type to current administration-faculty unrest.

Finally, investigators should consider the implications of the extent and growth of faculty participation to the theory and practice of educational administration and the training of administrators.

Are administrators to be leaders, skilled in creating consensus through group deliberation? Are they to be expert executors, implementing policies framed primarily by faculty and board? Are they to be decision-makers?

And even assuming that the present administrative role is to be maintained, how is it to be done in a climate of teacher militancy and strife? Is there needed a new breed of administrator, skilled in the personnel and human relations arts beyond all others?

Whatever the results of investigation into these problems, the speculation is a safe one that the traditional role of board, administration, faculty and students in the governance of junior colleges and educational institutions in general will undergo sharp revision in the immediate future.

Recommendations

In anticipation of these changing roles, several practical measures can be recommended to prevent the confrontation and strife between faculty and administration which has already been in evidence.

First, schools of educational administration should begin to concern themselves more with courses and programs to prepare administrators in the art of professional negotiation with teachers and public employees. Formal instruction in the theory and practice of academic governance should also be a part of such programs. Though educational administrators may not themselves conduct contract negotiations, they should, nevertheless, be aware of the problems and procedures of contract negotiation. Labor unions have already anticipated the tremendous potential in organizing public employees, including teachers. The law schools have begun to offer courses in collective bargaining in the public sector. Why should schools of public administration lag behind?

Secondly, the great national educational organizations through workshops and meetings must continue to hew out guidelines for the involvement of faculty and students in academic governance. There have been good beginnings in this direction already, such as the American Association for Higher Education report previously alluded to. The educational establishment cannot hide its head from the growing demands of faculty to be included in the governance of educational institutions.

Thirdly, state legislatures should deal realistically with the problem of faculty participation before it manifests itself in teacher resignations, turmoil, and confrontation. Legislation along the lines of the California and New York statutes can provide leadership and direction for the restructuring of power in public colleges.

Fourthly, perhaps a new kind of administrative specialist should be created to deal specifically with faculty. The traditional office of Dean of Faculty and Instruction may give way to two offices--one concerned specifically with faculty. The growth in size and complexity of educational institutions has created other administrative specialities; why not one in faculty personnel?

All of these recommendations imply a common principle: preparation through education and discussion is necessary to deal intelligently and effectively with the inevitably increasing demand of faculty members to participate in decisions affecting their working conditions and the direction and philosophy of the institutions they serve.

Books

American Junior Colleges, Ed. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. and Paul L. Houts.
Washington: American Council on Education, 1967.

Anderson, G. Lester. "The Organizational Character of American Colleges and Universities," The Study of Academic Administration. Ed. Terry Lunsford. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1953, pp. 1-20.

Blocker, Clyde E., Plummer, Robert H., and Richardson, Richard C., Jr. The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1965.

Clarke, Burton R. "Faculty Organization and Authority," The Study of Academic Administration. Ed. Terry Lunsford. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1953, pp. 37-52.

Clarke, Burton R. The Open Door College. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Dill, William R. "Decision-Making," Behavioral Science and Administration. Ed. Daniel E. Griffiths, Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Faculty Participation in Community College Governance: An Annotated Bibliography. Seattle: Center for the Development of Community College Education at the University of Washington, 1967.

Gore, William J. Administrative Decision-Making: A Heuristic Model. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Medsker, Leland L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Miller, Ward Ira. Democracy in Educational Administration. New York: Teachers College Columbia University, 1942.

1967 Junior College Directory. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

Russel, John H. and Ayers, Archie R. Case Studies in the Liberal Arts College, Academic Administration. U.S. Department HEW Bulletin 1964, Number 12,

OE 53020. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964.

Periodicals

- Bartky, John. "The Nature of Junior College Administration," Junior College Journal, XXVIII (September, 1957), 3-7.
- Brackett, Russell D. "Faculty Council," Nation's Schools, LVIII (December, 1956), 61-62.
- Cornell, Francis G. "When Should Teachers Share in Making Administrative Decisions?" Nation's Schools, LIII (May, 1954), 43-35.
- Dunn, John W., Jowise, Peter, and Gentile, Ralph. "Our Faculty Participates in Policy Development," Junior College Journal, XXXVII (December-January, 1966), 10-13.
- Dykes, Archie R. "Democracy, Teachers, and Educational Decision-Making," School and Society, XCII (April 4, 1964), 155-56.
- Henderson, Algo D. "Decision Making by Junior College Faculty," School and Society, XCII (May 1, 1965), 92.
- Howe, Ray A. "Faculty Administration Relationships In Extremis," Junior College Journal, XXXVII (November, 1966), 14-15.
- Lahti, Robert E. "Faculty Role in Policy Formulation," Junior College Journal, XXXVII (September, 1966), 9-12.
- Lombardi, John. "Faculty in the Administrative Process," Junior College Journal, XXXVIII (November, 1966), 9-16.
- Magnis, Robert F. "The Advisory Council--Experiment in Democratic Cooperation," Junior College Journal, XXXI (January, 1961) 258-60.
- Moeller, G. H. "Bureaucracy and Teachers' Sense of Power," School Review, LXXXII (Summer, 1964), 137-57.
- Ploghoft, Milton E. "Teacher Participation in Selecting New Personnel," Clearing House, XXXII (January, 1958) 301-03.
- Priest, Bill J. "Faculty Administrator Relationships," Junior College Journal, XXXIV (March, 1964), 4-8.
- Provus, M.M. and deLauter, A. "Self Direction for Teachers; The Time to Teach Project," NEA Journal, LV (January, 1966), 49-51.

- Richardson, R. C., Jr. "Policy Formulation in the Two Year College: Renaissance or Revolution?" Junior College Journal, XXVII (March, 1967) 40-42.
- Taylor, Morris F. and Dick, Herbert W. "More About the Nature of Junior College Administration," Junior College Journal, XXVIII (December, 1957) 20-22.
- Weldon, Herbert. "An Experiment in Faculty Planning," Junior College Journal XXIV (April, 1965), 28-30.
- Winter, Carl. "Academic Senates in the Junior Colleges," California Education, (November, 1964), 15-16+.

Reports

American Association for Higher Education. Faculty Participation in Academic Governance. Report of the AAHE Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiations, Campus Governance Program. Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1967.

Report of the Subcommittee on the Role of Faculty in Institutional-Policy-Making. American Association of Junior Colleges Commission on Administration, 1967. (Mimeographed)

Unpublished Material

Articles of Organization, Faculty Council of the Community Colleges which operate within the program of the State University of New York. April 13, 1967.

Bentley, Norma E. "The Role of Faculty in Community College Policy Making," Unpublished manuscript, Cazenovia College, 1966.

California Education Code.

Eaton, Miles W. "The Role of Faculty in Community College Policy Making." Unpublished manuscript, Orange Coast College, 1966.

Regulations for Community Colleges Operating Within the Program of State University of New York. Adopted by the State University Trustees June 11, 1966.

Rislov, Sigurd. "Faculty Participation in Community College Government." Unpublished manuscript, Wayne State University, College of Education, 1965.

Schauerman, Sam. "A Survey of Academic Senates in California Junior Colleges."
Unpublished manuscript, El Camino College, 1966.

Taylor, John W. Letter to Mr. Michael Kaufman, July 25, 1967.

Tunnell, James Wesley. "Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation in the
Public Junior College." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Department of
Education, Texas Technological College, 1963.

APPENDIX A

The following questions relate to the manner in which faculty participates in administrative decision-making. Please check the appropriate response in each case. If none of the alternatives seems to apply to your situation, we would appreciate a short written response in the space labeled other.

- I. Does your faculty participate in decision-making regarding the yearly revision in the salary schedule?

Yes _____

No _____

What form does this participation take (if answer is Yes)?

- a) informal discussion and consultation _____
- b) appearance of teachers before Board _____
- c) collective bargaining negotiation _____
- d) other: _____

- II. Does your faculty participate in decision-making regarding class size and/or teacher load?

Yes _____

No _____

What form does this participation take (if answer is Yes)?

- a) informal discussion and consultation _____
- b) faculty committee discusses and advises _____
- c) faculty controls policy _____
- d) other: _____

- III. Does your faculty participate in decision-making regarding one or more of the following student personnel practices: admission, withdrawal, probation, student discipline, or other student personnel practices?

Yes _____

No _____

- a) informal discussion and consultation_____
- b) faculty committee discusses and advises_____
- c) faculty controls policy_____
- d) other:

IV. Does your faculty participate in decision-making relating to the introduction of new curricula and/or the modification of existing curricula?

Yes_____

No_____

What form does this participation take (if answer is Yes)?

- a) informal discussion and consultation_____
- b) faculty committee discusses and advises_____
- c) faculty controls policy_____
- d) other:

V. Does your faculty participate in decision-making regarding one or more of the following: design and construction of new buildings, remodeling of existing facilities, space allocation, and room use?

Yes_____

No_____

What form does this participation take (if answer is Yes)?

- a) informal discussion and consultation_____
- b) faculty committee discusses and advises_____
- c) faculty controls policy_____
- d) other:

VII. Does your faculty participate in decision-making regarding the appointment of new teachers and/or the granting of tenure?

Yes_____

No_____

What form does this participation take (if answer is Yes)?

- a) informal discussion and consultation_____
- b) faculty committee or department discusses and advises_____

- c) faculty committee or department controls decisions _____
- d) other: _____

VII. Does your faculty participate in decision-making regarding the appointment of department chairmen and/or administrators?

Yes _____

No _____

What form does this participation take (if answer is Yes)?

- a) informal discussion and consultation _____
- b) faculty committee or department discusses and advises _____
- c) faculty controls decisions, elects chairmen, nominates administrators, etc. _____
- d) other: _____

PLEASE FURNISH WHATEVER OF THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION REQUESTED THAT YOU CAN:

1. In what size town is your institution located?

- a) under 50,000 _____
- b) over 50,000 _____

2. About how many students were enrolled last Fall? _____

3. About how many teachers do you generally employ full time? _____
part time? _____

4. About what percentage of your teachers are recruited from

- a) elementary and secondary school teaching? _____%
- b) graduate schools and college teaching? _____%
- c) other sources? _____%

5. What is the unit of administrative control of your college?

- a) unified district (common schools and junior college combined) _____
- b) junior college district _____
- c) state junior college _____
- d) branch of a four year institution _____
- e) other: _____

6. What kind of physical facilities do you have?
- a) separate junior college building _____
 - b) facilities shared with secondary school _____
 - c) facilities shared with another college _____
 - d) other: _____
7. Do you have a faculty council or faculty senate?
- a) Yes _____
 - b) No _____
8. Does your Board recognize a bargaining agent for teachers?
- a) Yes _____
 - b) No _____
9. If the answer to the above question is Yes, is this bargaining agent
- a) AFT affiliate? _____
 - b) NEA affiliate? _____
 - c) other? _____
10. Does your Board have a collective bargaining contract with teachers?
- a) Yes _____
 - b) No _____
11. Has your Board or governing body passed rules or set policy specifically designed to encourage faculty participation in administrative decision-making?
- a) Yes _____
 - b) No _____
12. Please outline briefly the nature of these rules or this policy (if the answer to Question 11, is Yes).

APPENDIX B

Dear Friend:

This questionnaire is being distributed to every chief administrator, dean, or president of a public junior college in your state as part of a study of the way in which faculty is involved in administrative decision-making. Would you please take the time to provide the information requested? It is understood that nowhere in this study will individual persons or institutions be identified.

Thank you for your help.

Gilbert Schechtman
Southeast Campus
Chicago City College
8600 S. Anthony Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60617

APPENDIX C

Dear Faculty Council President:

I am engaged in a study of faculty participation in administrative decision-making in public junior colleges. I would very much appreciate it if you could take the time to supply the information requested in the questionnaire which I have enclosed. If some of the information is not readily available, simply omit it. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Gilbert Schechtman
Southeast Campus
Chicago City College
8600 South Anthony Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60617

APPENDIX D

Dear Chairman:

I am engaged in a study of faculty participation in administrative decision-making in public junior colleges. I would very much appreciate it if you could take the time to supply the information requested in the questionnaire which I have enclosed. I have directed this to you simply because I desire a response from a faculty member, and I am a chairman of an English department. If some of the information is not available, simply omit it. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Gilbert Schechtman
Southeast Campus
Chicago City College
8600 South Anthony Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60617

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Gilbert Schechtman has been read and approved by members of the Department of Education.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

May 22, 1968
Date

ms Keller
Signature of Adviser